

CRA

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



CONESTOGA-ROVERS & ASSOCIATES

1801 Old Highway 8, Suite 114

St. Paul, Minnesota 55112

(612) 639-0913

Fax:(612) 639-0923

June 20, 1995

Reference No. 3481

Ms. Sheri Bianchin
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY (USEPA)
Region V (HSRL-6J)
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590

Dear Ms. Bianchin:

Re: Proposed Effluent Goals for Discharge
of Treated Groundwater
American Chemical Service

Please find enclosed Montgomery-Watson's proposed effluent standards for the Perimeter Groundwater Containment System.

Sincerely,

CONESTOGA-ROVERS & ASSOCIATES

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Frehner".

Ronald Frehner

RF/bam

Enc.

c.c. Holly Grejda; IDEM
George Oliver; IDEM
ACS Technical Committee



MONTGOMERY WATSON

June 20, 1995

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region V (HSRL-6J)
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Project No.: 4077.0102

ATTN: Ms. Sheri Bianchin

SUBJECT: Proposed Effluent Goals for Discharge of Treated Groundwater
American Chemical Service, Inc. Superfund Site
Griffith, Indiana

Dear Ms. Bianchin:

As we discussed in our meeting on June 14, 1995, Montgomery Watson is designing and planning to implement a perimeter groundwater containment system (PGCS) at the American Chemical Service, Inc. (ACS) Site. The PGCS will include a groundwater extraction system in the upper aquifer along the western and northern boundaries of the site, a groundwater treatment system, and a treated effluent discharge system. In accordance with the ROD for the site, treated groundwater must be discharged to the adjacent wetlands and, if necessary, to a nearby surface water body (Turkey Creek). Currently, we are planning to discharge only to the on-site wetlands adjacent to the ACS facility. As stated in the National Contingency Plan (NCP), a permit for discharging the effluent is not required since the discharge point will be on site. We will, however, need to meet the substantive requirements typically included in a permit, and as such, effluent standards need to be established.

Since the effluent goals are a critical factor in selecting technologies for treatment of the groundwater, it is essential that we expeditiously establish these goals. For our initial evaluation of treatment alternatives, we developed effluent quality goals for the chemicals of concern (in the groundwater) listed in the ROD. Table 1 provides the proposed effluent quality goals for discharge of treated groundwater to the adjacent wetlands. The Table lists the constituents of concern identified in the ROD, and it represents a cross-section of the contaminants present at the site.

The effluent goals presented in the Table are the chronic aquatic water quality criteria from the Water Quality Standards in Article 2 of 327 Indiana Administrative Code (IAC). For some constituents, the state had not established standards, so we calculated them using the procedures specified in Section 8.3 of Article 2 of 327 IAC.

United States Environmental Protection Agency

June 20, 1995

Page 2

This letter is a formal request that you review the proposed initial effluent quality goals presented in Table 1 and provide confirmation of their acceptability, or if unacceptable, proposed alternative effluent goals. To meet our design schedule, we request your comments by June 30, 1995.

During recent groundwater monitoring, several of the compounds listed as chemicals of concern (in the groundwater) in the ROD were found to be at non-detectable concentrations or at concentrations significantly below the proposed effluent goals presented in Table 1. We propose that compounds not present in the groundwater be eliminated from the final effluent goals for the treatment system. To select compounds for elimination, we suggest that a six-month monitoring period be established once a groundwater treatment system is brought on-line. Compounds listed in the initial effluent goals that are non-detectable or at concentrations below discharge limits in the untreated groundwater would be eliminated from the discharge goals and from further routine monitoring.

We trust that this letter provides sufficient information to allow you to address these issues and our proposals. However, should you require additional information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at (708) 691-5000 or Ron Schlicher at (801) 272-1900. Your prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MONTGOMERY WATSON


Joseph D. Adams Jr., P.E.
Vice President

/pa

cc: Holly Grejda; IDEM
George Oliver; IDEM

TABLE 1
PROPOSED EFFLUENT GOALS FOR DISCHARGE OF TREATED GROUNDWATER
AMERICAN CHEMICAL SERVICE, INC. NPL SITE

| Constituent | Units | Recommended Effluent Goal | Basis |
|---|-------|---------------------------|--|
| General Water Quality Parameters | | | |
| BOD ₅ | mg/l | 30 | Discharge standard typically set by IDEM. |
| TSS | mg/l | 30 | Discharge standard typically set by IDEM. |
| pH | s.u. | 6 to 9 | State CAWQC ^(b) |
| Inorganics | | | |
| Arsenic ^(a) | mg/l | 0.19 | State CAWQC |
| Beryllium | mg/l | --- | Not detected in groundwater at the site. |
| Manganese | mg/l | --- | Not detected at elevated levels in groundwater at the site. |
| Thallium | mg/l | --- | Not detected at elevated levels in groundwater at the site. |
| Volatile Organics | | | |
| Benzene | µg/l | 29 | Calculated CAWQC ^(c) |
| Chloromethane | µg/l | --- | No standards have been established and no aquatic toxicity data are available to calculate a standard. |
| 1,1-Dichloroethane | µg/l | --- | No standards have been established and no aquatic toxicity data are available to calculate a standard. |
| 1,2-Dichloroethene-cis | µg/l | --- | No standards have been established and no aquatic toxicity data are available to calculate a standard. |
| Ethylbenzene | µg/l | 34 | Calculated CAWQC |
| Methylene chloride | µg/l | 498 | Calculated CAWQC |
| Tetrachloroethene | µg/l | 24 | Calculated CAWQC |
| Trichloroethene | µg/l | 189 | Calculated CAWQC |
| Vinyl chloride | µg/l | --- | No standards have been established and no aquatic toxicity data are available to calculate a standard. |
| SemiVolatile Organics | | | |
| Acetone | µg/l | --- | No standards have been established and no aquatic toxicity data are available to calculate a standard. |
| bis(2-Chloroethyl)ether | µg/l | 533 | Calculated CAWQC |
| bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate | µg/l | 49 | Calculated CAWQC |
| 2-Butanone | µg/l | 7,156 | Calculated CAWQC |
| 1,4-Dichlorobenzene | µg/l | --- | No standards have been established and no aquatic toxicity data are available to calculate a standard. |
| Isophorone | µg/l | 267 | Calculated CAWQC |
| 4-Methyl-2-pentanone | µg/l | 1,160 | Calculated CAWQC |
| 4-Methylphenol | µg/l | 34 | Calculated CAWQC |
| Pentachlorophenol | µg/l | 3.83 | State CAWQC |
| PCBs | | | |
| PCBs | µg/l | 1.0 | Standard quantitation limit in water. |

(a) Concentration shown is for dissolved arsenic only.

(b) State CAWQC = the State Chronic Aquatic Water Quality Criterion from the Water Quality Standards in Article 2 of 327 Indiana Administrative Code.

(c) Calculated CAWQC means the chronic aquatic criterion was calculated using the procedures described in Section 8.3 of Article 2 of 327 Indiana Administrative Code.



MONTGOMERY WATSON

BY BF DATE 6/27/95 CLIENT ACS TECHNICAL CORP. SHEET 1 OF 2
CHKD BY EJS DESCRIPTION EFFLUENT LOAD CALCULATIONS JOB NO. 4077.0102

SAMPLE CALCULATIONS FOR DETERMINING THE ACUTE AQUATIC CRITERION
AND THE CHRONIC AQUATIC CRITERION:

ACS SITE, GRIFFITH, INDIANA.

TO BEGIN, A SEARCH WAS PERFORMED ON US EPA'S AQUATIC TOXICITY INFORMATION RETRIEVAL (AQUIRE) DATABASE.

REFERENCE : U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
NATIONAL HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS RESEARCH LAB.
MID-CONTINENT ECOLOGY DIVISION

THE PURPOSE OF THE SEARCH WAS TO FIND TOXICITY DATA FOR 5 SPECIES OF AQUATIC LIFE :

DAPHNIA MAGNA
DAPHNIA PULEX
BLUEGILL
RAINBOW TROUT
FATHEAD MINNOW

THE SEARCH WAS PERFORMED FOR ALL ORGANIC PRIORITY POLLUTANTS.

THE FOLLOWING OUTLINE USES ETHYL BENZENE AS AN EXAMPLE :

- DETERMINE THE FINAL ACUTE VALUE (FAV):

THE TOXICITY DATA OBTAINED FROM THE AQUIRE SEARCH IS IN THE FORM OF A 1, 2, or 4 DAY LC50 MEASURING MORTALITY. IN MOST CASES THERE IS MORE THAN ONE LC50 VALUE GIVEN, THEREFORE THE GEOMETRIC MEAN IS FOUND, THE ^{species with the} LOWEST GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED TO DETERMINE THE FAV. IN THE CASE OF ETHYL BENZENE, THE RAINBOW TROUT HAS THE LOWEST MEAN. THAT VALUE IS 7670 ug/l.



MONTGOMERY WATSON

BY BF DATE 6/27/95 CLIENT ACS TECHNICAL COM. SHEET 2 OF 2
CHKO BY RJS DESCRIPTION EFFLUENT LOAD CALCULATIONS JOB NO 4077.0102

ACCORDING TO INDIANA WATER QUALITY STANDARDS, THE
FAV = $LC50 \div 5$ IF TOXICITY DATA FOR RAINBOW TROUT
IS AVAILABLE. IF DATA FOR THE RAINBOW TROUT IS NOT AVAILABLE
THEN THE FAV = $LC50 \div 10$.

SO IN THIS CASE $FAV = 7670 \mu\text{g/L} \div 5 = \underline{1534 \mu\text{g/L}}$

* DETERMINE THE ACUTE AQUATIC CRITERION (AAC):
THE PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING THE AAC IS FOUND IN
SECTION 8.2 OF THE INDIANA WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.
WE FOLLOWED METHOD 3 WHICH GIVES:

$$AAC = FAV \div 2$$

$$AAC = 1534 \div 2 = \underline{767 \mu\text{g/L}}$$

* DETERMINE THE CHRONIC AQUATIC CRITERION (CAC):
THE PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING THE CAC IS FOUND IN
SECTION 8.3 OF THE INDIANA WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.
WE FOLLOWED METHOD 4 WHICH GIVES:

$$CAC = FAV \div 45$$

$$CAC = 1534 \div 45 = \underline{34.1 \mu\text{g/L}}$$

Development of Effluent Criteria from Aquatic Toxicity Data

Summary of Acute Toxicity Data (LC50 Values)^(a) from AQUIRE Data Base

| Constituent | LC50, $\mu\text{g/l}$ (a) | Assay Organism (b) | Assay Length, days | No. of References (c) | Trout Present (d) | FAV, $\mu\text{g/l}$ (e) | AAC, $\mu\text{g/l}$ (f) | CAC, $\mu\text{g/l}$ (g) | Included in proposed effluent goals |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Acetone | NA | | | | | | | | |
| 5,300(A) Benzene | 6,600 | T | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 / 1,320 | 660 | 29.3 | |
| bis(2-Chloroethyl)ether | 240,000 | DM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 24,000 | 12,000 | 533.3 | |
| bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate | 11,000 | DM | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 / 2,200 | 1,100 | 48.9 | |
| 2-Butanone | 3,220,000 | FHM | 4 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 322,000 | 161,000 | 7,155.6 | |
| Butyl benzyl phthalate | NA | | | | | | | | |
| Chloroethane | NA | | | | | | | | |
| Chloromethane | NA | | | | | | | | |
| 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol | 2,000 | DM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 200 | 100 | 4.4 | |
| 763 1,2-Dichlorobenzene | NA | | | | | | | | |
| 1,1-Dichloroethane | NA | | | | | | | | |
| 20,000 1,2-Dichloroethane | 125,000 | FHM | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 / 25,000 | 12,500 | 556.6 | |
| 1,1-Dichloroethene | 135,000 | FHM | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 / 13,500 | 6,750 | 300.0 | |
| 1,2-Dichloroethene-cis | NA | | | | | | | | |
| 1,2-Dichloroethene-trans | NA | | | | | | | | |
| 5,700 1,2-Dichloropropane | 52,000 | DM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 5,200 | 2,600 | 115.6 | |
| Diethyl phthalate | 31,800 | FHM | 4 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 3,180 | 1,590 | 70.7 | |
| 530(4d) 2,4-Dimethylphenol 1300(1-hr) | 2,100 | DM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 210 | 105 | 4.7 | |
| 3 Dimeethyl phthalate | 33,000 | DM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 3,300 | 1,650 | 73.3 | |
| Di-n-butyl phthalate | 820 | BG | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 / 164 | .82 | 3.6 | |
| 32,002(A) Ethylbenzene | 7,670 | T | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 / 1,634 | 767 | 34.1 | |
| 117,000(A) Isophorone | 120,000 | DM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 12,000 | 6,000 | 266.7 | |
| Methylene Chloride | 224,000 | BG | 1-4 | 2 | 2 | 10 / 22,400 | 11,200 | 497.8 | |
| 4-Methyl-2-pentanone | 622,000 | FHM | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 / 62,200 | 26,100 | 1,160.0 | |
| 4-Methylphenol | 7,700 | T | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 / 1,540 | 770 | 34.2 | |
| 620 Naphthalene | 3,400 | T | 4 | 7 | 1 | 5 / 680 | 340 | 16.1 | |
| 2-Nitrophenol | 66,900 | BG | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 6,690 | 3,345 | 148.7 | |
| 2,560 Phenol | 8,960 | T | 4 | 7 | 1 | 5 / 1,792 | 896 | 39.8 | |
| Tetrachloroethene | 5,400 | T | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 / 1,080 | 540 | 24.0 | |
| Tetrahydrofuran | 2,160,000 | FHM | 4 | 1 | 2 | 10 / 216,000 | 108,000 | 4,800.0 | |
| 17,500(A) Toluene | 11,700 | T | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 / 2,340 | 1,170 | 52.0 | |
| 1,1,1-Trichloroethane | 40,000 | BG | 1-4 | 2 | 2 | 10 / 4,000 | 2,000 | 88.9 | |
| Trichloroethene | 42,600 | T | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 / 8,520 | 4,260 | 189.3 | |
| Trichloroethoxymethane | NA | | | | | | | | |
| Vinyl chloride | NA | | | | | | | | |
| Xylenes, p | 2,600 | T | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 / 520 | 260 | 11.6 | |
| Xylenes, m | 8,400 | T | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 / 1,680 | 840 | 37.3 | |
| 10014 PCBs (24-h) | | | | | | | | | quantitation limit 1.0 |

(a) Insufficient data available in AQUIRE Database.

(b) The LC50 values reported are the geometric mean for the most sensitive species (i.e., the lowest geometric mean of the four species for which data was available).

(c) The most sensitive species (organism with lowest LC50 value), BG-Bioassay, DM-Daphnia Magna, FHM-Palaeon Mollusca, T-Rainbow Trout.

(d) Number of references available in the data base for the most sensitive species (number used for calculating the geometric mean).

(e) 1-Meanay data available for rainbow trout, 2-No bioassay data available for rainbow trout.

(f) FAV=LC50/5 if data on rainbow trout were available, FAV=LC50/10 if data on rainbow trout were not available.

(g) AAC=FAV/2

(h) CAC=FAV/5

$$\text{FAV} = \text{LC50}/5 \text{ for trout data}$$
$$\text{LC50}/10 \text{ w/o trout data}$$

FAV - final acute value

AAC - acute aquatic criteria

CAC - chronic "

+100% JIF: E-17

Table 2-1

Surface Water Concentrations
 American Chemical Services
 Griffith, Indiana

| Contaminant | Maximum Detected Concentration ($\mu\text{g/L}$) | | Water Quality Criteria ^a ($\mu\text{g/L}$) | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------|---|---------|
| | Shallow Aquifer-Wetlands | Drainage Ditches | Acute | Chronic |
| Volatile Organics | | | | |
| Chloromethane | 6.8E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 1.1E+4 | None |
| Vinyl chloride | 7.2E+2 | <1.0E+1 | None | None |
| Chloroethane | 2.0E+3 | 3.0E+1 | None | None |
| Methylene chloride | 3.8E+2 | <5.0E+0 | 1.1E+4 | None |
| Acetone | 9.9E+4 | 3.8E+2 | None | None |
| 1,1-Dichloroethane | 2.4E+3 | 1.0E+0 | 1.18E+5 | 2.0E+4 |
| 1,2-Dichloroethene (total) | 4.0E+2 | 3.0E+0 | None | None |
| 2-Butanone | 2.2E+5 | 1.4E+2 | None | None |
| Trichloroethene | 4.5E+1 | <5.0E+0 | 4.5E+4 | 2.19E+4 |
| Benzene | 1.0E+5 | 4.8E+2 | 5.3E+3 | None |
| 4-Methyl-2-pentanone | 5.4E+4 | 4.9E+1 | None | None |
| 2-Hexanone | 1.8E+3 | 4.0E+1 | None | None |
| Tetrachloroethene | 2.0E+2 | <5.0E+0 | 5.28E+3 | 8.4E+2 |
| Toluene | 2.3E+3 | 8.0E+0 | 1.75E+4 | None |
| Chlorobenzene | 9.8E+1 | <5.0E+0 | 2.5E+2 | 5.0E+1 |
| Ethylbenzene | 1.1E+3 | 6.0E+0 | 3.2E+4 | None |
| Xylenes (mixed) | 3.0E+3 | 3.5E+1 | None | None |
| Semivolatiles | | | | |
| Phenol | 2.4E+2 | 4.5E+1 | 1.02E+4 | 2.56E+3 |
| Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether | 2.5E+2 | 7.7E+1 | 2.38E+5 | None |
| 1,3-Dichlorobenzene | 3.0E+0 | <1.0E+1 | 1.12E+3 | 7.63E+2 |

Ecological Risk Assessment
 American Chemical Services
 Revision: 2
 Date: 19 March 1992
 Page: 2-3

Table 2-1 (Continued)

Surface Water Concentrations
 American Chemical Services
 Griffith, Indiana

| Contaminant | Maximum Detected Concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$) | | Water Quality Criteria ^a ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$) | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|--|---------|
| | Shallow Aquifer-Wetlands | Drainage Ditches | Acute | Chronic |
| 1,4-Dichlorobenzene | 1.0E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 1.12E+3 | 7.63E+2 |
| 1,2-Dichlorobenzene | 3.3E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 1.12E+3 | 7.63E+2 |
| 2-Methylphenol | 3.8E+1 | 5.0E+0 | None | None |
| Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether | 3.0E+2 | 2.9E+1 | 2.38E+5 | None |
| 4-Methylphenol | 2.2E+3 | 5.9E+2 | None | None |
| Isophorone | 3.5E+1 | 5.0E+0 | 1.17E+5 | None |
| 2,4-Dimethylphenol | 1.1E+2 | 1.2E+1 | 2.12E+3 | None |
| Naphthalene | 7.1E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 2.3E+3 | 6.2E+2 |
| 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol | 5.0E+0 | 2.0E+0 | 3.0E+1 | None |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene | 2.7E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 2.3E+3 | 6.2E+2 |
| Diethylphthalate | 9.0E+0 | <1.0E+1 | 9.4E+2 | 3.0E+0 |
| Pentachlorophenol | 3.0E+0 | <5.0E+1 | 2.0E+1 | 1.3E+1 |
| Di-n-butylphthalate | 2.0E+0 | <1.0E+1 | 9.4E+2 | None |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | 5.0E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 9.4E+2 | 3.0E+0 |
| Benzoic acid | 1.9E+3 | 8.5E+1 | None | None |
| Pesticides /PCBs | | | | |
| Aroclor 1248 | 2.6E+0 | <5.0E-1 | 2.0E+0 | 1.4E-2 |
| Aroclor 1260 | 2.7E+1 | <1.0E+0 | 2.0E+0 | 1.4E-2 |
| Inorganics | | | | |
| Aluminum | 2.8E+2 | 7.6E+2 | None | None |
| Arsenic | 4.32E+1 | 4.5E+1 | 3.6E+2 | 1.9E+2 |
| Barium | 1.84E+3 | 3.3E+2 | None | None |

Table 2-1 (Continued)

Surface Water Concentrations
 American Chemical Services
 Griffith, Indiana

| Contaminant | Maximum Detected Concentration ($\mu\text{g/L}$) | | Water Quality Criteria ^a ($\mu\text{g/L}$) | |
|-----------------------------|--|------------------|---|----------------|
| | Shallow Aquifer-Wetlands | Drainage Ditches | Acute | Chronic |
| Beryllium | 2.5E-1 | 2.8E-1 | 1.3E+2 | 5.3E+0 |
| Cadmium ^b | 3.1E+0 | 3.7E-1 | 5.7E+0(9.1E+0) | 1.5E+0(2.0E+0) |
| Calcium | 1.04E+6 | 3.34E+5 | None | None |
| Chromium (VI) ^c | 3.9E-1 | 2.8E+0 | 1.6E+1 | 1.1E+1 |
| Chromium (III) ^c | 3.51E+0 | 2.52E+1 | 2.3E+3(3.2E+3) | 2.7E+2(3.8E+2) |
| Cobalt | <5.0E+1 | <5.0E+1 | None | None |
| Copper ^b | <2.0E+1 | <2.0E+1 | 2.4E+1(3.6E+1) | 1.6E+1(2.2E+1) |
| Iron | 2.18E+5 | 1.43E+4 | None | 1.0E+3 |
| Lead ^b | 4.6E+0 | 1.62E+1 | 1.2E+2(2.1E+2) | 4.9E+0(8.2E+0) |
| Magnesium | 7.88E+4 | 6.17E+4 | None | None |
| Manganese | 4.25E+3 | 1.85E+3 | None | None |
| Mercury | 1.7E+0 | <2.0E-1 | 2.4E+0 | 1.2E-2 |
| Nickel ^b | 5.3E+1 | 8.0E+1 | 1.9+3(2.6E+3) | 2.0E+2(3.0E+2) |
| Potassium | 9.58E+4 | 3.0E+4 | None | None |
| Selenium | 6.2E+0 | 2.1E+0 | 2.0E+1 | 5.0E+0 |
| Sodium | 4.44E+5 | 7.7E+4 | None | None |
| Thallium | 4.0E+0 | <5.0E+0 | 1.4E+3 | 4.0E+1 |
| Vanadium | 2.59E+1 | <2.0E+0 | None | None |

Table 2-1 (Continued)

Surface Water Concentrations
American Chemical Services
Griffith, Indiana

| Contaminant | Maximum Detected Concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$) | | Water Quality Criteria ^a ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$) | |
|-------------------|---|------------------|--|----------------|
| | Shallow Aquifer-Wetlands | Drainage Ditches | Acute | Chronic |
| Zinc ^b | 8.86E+2 | 8.8E+1 | 1.5E+2(2.2E+2) | 1.4E+2(2.0E+2) |
| Cyanide | 1.0E+1 | <1.0E+1 | 2.2E+1 | 5.2E+0 |

^a Either Ambient Water Quality Criteria or Lowest Reported Toxic Concentration.

^b Hardness - dependent criteria: assumes 139 mg/L (Ca + Mg) for the drainage ditches and 210 mg/L (Ca + Mg) for the shallow aquifer; values in parentheses are criteria based on the shallow aquifer hardness.

^c Assumes total chromium is 10% Cr (VI) and 90% Cr (III).

Sources: IRIS, 1991; Verschueren, 1983, U.S. EPA, 1989, U.S. EPA, 1986.

None - Criteria not available.